REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-16 and 18 are pending. Claims 7-9 and 16 are allowed. Reconsideration and allowance based on the below comments are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 10, 12-14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murayama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,346,936) and claims 5-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama and Nishino Kenji (JP Patent No. 06-12195). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

For reasons of brevity, applicants arguments filed in the Response dated February 5, 2004 are hereby incorporated by reference.

The Office Action alleges that Murayama teaches the varying of frequency as recited in applicant's claimed combinations. The Office Action relies upon column 1, lines 27-59 and column 5, lines 60-67 in Murayama to support this allegation. Column 1 of Murayama discloses the use of R, G, B drivers for a LCD panel. Column 5 discloses the use of a phase shifter for varying the phase of different signals. Nowhere do these two sections, or anywhere in Murayama, disclose varying a frequency or waveform characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 12, 16 and 18.

The Office Action appears to misinterpret phase as being the same as frequency. Applicant respectfully submits that phase and frequency are not the same and therefore cannot be used interchangeably. The phase relates to the

angle of a signal on a time axis from a given starting point. The frequency is a measurement of the number of cycles of the signal over a given time interval. Although phase can be measured for a given frequency, the phase can be varied without changing the frequency. In fact, the phase is most likely determined based on a single frequency.

Thus, Murayama teaches contrary to the present invention by varying of the phase and not varying a frequency characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner, as recited in applicant's independent claims. Further, Nishino Kenji fails to make up for the deficiencies of Murayama. Thus, each and every feature of applicant's claimed combinations are not taught by the combination of references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10, 12-16 and 18 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

DRA/CJB:cb 2257-0207P

Attachment(s)

P.O. Box 747 Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 (703) 205-8000